

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MARC COHODES,

Plaintiff,

v.

MIMEDX GROUP, INC., et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. [22-cv-00368-RFL](#) (KAW)

**ORDER REGARDING PLAINTIFF'S
REQUEST FOR TELEPHONIC
CONFERENCE AND ALTERNATIVE
PROCEDURES**

Re: Dkt. No. 242

On October 14, 2025, Plaintiff Mark Cohodes filed a request for a telephonic conference to enforce meet and confer requirements and to fashion alternative procedures to resolve further discovery disputes. (Dkt. No. 242.) Plaintiff's request was based on Defendant Derrick Snowdy's failure to provide adequate discovery responses and to meet and confer.

Specifically, Plaintiff stated that he served Defendant Snowdy with Requests for Admission ("RFAs") and Requests for Production ("RFPs") on February 21, 2025. (Judge Decl. ¶ 3.) Following an April 24, 2025 meet and confer, Defendant Snowdy agreed to provide amended responses by May 5, 2025. (Judge Decl. ¶ 3.) After Plaintiff repeatedly followed up, Defendant Snowdy provided amended responses to the RFAs only on May 15, 2025. (Judge Decl. ¶ 4.) Following a May 23, 2025 meet and confer regarding a separate discovery issue, Defendant Snowdy agreed to provide amended responses to the RFPs and RFAs by May 29, 2025. (Judge Decl. ¶ 4.) After he failed to do so, Plaintiff's counsel again followed up repeatedly. (Judge Decl. ¶ 4.) On July 16, 2025, Defendant Snowdy agreed to provide amended responses to the RFPs by July 21, 2025. (Judge Decl. ¶ 4.) On July 23, 2025, Defendant Snowdy provided amended responses to the RFPs, indicating that he would produce documents. (Judge Decl. ¶ 5.) To date, however, Defendant Snowdy has not provided any responsive documents, despite Plaintiff

1 reaching out on August 14, 2025, August 22, 2025, September 4, 2025, September 10, 2025,
2 September 24, 2025, and September 26, 2025. (Judge Decl. ¶ 5.) Defendant Snowdy did not
3 respond to any of these e-mails. (Judge Decl. ¶ 5.)

4 To date, Defendant Snowdy has not filed a response to the motion.

5 The Court does not believe a telephonic conference is required at this time. The Court,
6 however, ORDERS as follows:


7 (1) Defendant Snowdy shall meet and confer with Plaintiff within **three business days**
8 of the date of this order on all outstanding discovery requests. Going forward, Defendant Snowdy
9 shall respond to meet and confer requests within **three business days** of the request, and meet and
10 confer within **five business days** of the request absent a showing of good cause of unavailability
11 or agreement by Plaintiff.

12 (2) Defendant Snowdy shall supplement his responses to RFAs and produce all
13 responsive documents within **seven calendar days** of the date of this order, as well as a privilege
14 log as to any documents being withheld on the grounds of privilege.

15 Should Defendant Snowdy fail to comply fully with this order, Plaintiff is permitted to file
16 a motion for discovery sanctions and attorney's fees related to discovery, including for time spent
17 trying to get Defendant Snowdy to meet and confer.

18 IT IS SO ORDERED.

19 Dated: October 23, 2025

20 
KANDIS A. WESTMORE
21 United States Magistrate Judge
22
23
24
25
26
27
28